



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,418	12/28/2000	Chul Kim	P-174	5679
34610	7590	05/10/2004	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			SHAW, JOSEPH D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2141		
DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/749,418	KIM, CHUL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Joseph D Shaw	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 9-12, 14-21 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4, 6-8, 13 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                          |                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                              |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

Art Unit: 2141

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because Figures 1 and 2 disclose a "TRAP POU" whereas the specification makes reference to the correct term, a TRAP PDU. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. The disclosure recites in various locations "that more than two objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition" (Abstract; page 5, lines 1-3; page 7, lines 17-21; page 9, lines 16-23). However, the disclosure also recites several examples of only two correlated objects for defining a trap condition (objects B and C; page 7, lines 17-21; objects A and B; page 8, lines 12-23). Thus, the disclosure appears to contradict itself. Appropriate correction is required.

b. On page 1, line 25, "MET" should be replaced with "SET."

c. On page 3, line 10, "agetcn" should be replaced with "agent."

***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 8 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous

Art Unit: 2141

claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitation "the trap generation condition is defined by correlating more than two objects," recited in claim 8, is the same limitation as "more than two objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition" that appears claim 1.

4. Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

d. As per claims 1, 8, 13, and 22, the disclosure appears to contradict itself on the matter of how many objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition, as described above. The claims recite the limitation claiming more than two correlated objects for defining the generation of a trap. Due to the lack of clarity in the disclosure, it is unclear how to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

e. As per claim 17, there is an erroneous line break on line 5 that divides the word "checking" into "c" and "hecking."

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2141

6. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Faigon et al. (6,006,016).

f. As per claim 1, Faigon teaches:

a method for controlling trap generation of an SNMP which is operated a manager and at least one agent (fault correlator collects traps generated by an agent via SNMP and determines when to forward the traps in the form of a meta-trap to the network management station; col. 6, line 54 - col. 7, line 19),

wherein a TrapFlag field and a TrapPeer field are defined for each management object resource in describing an MIB of an SNMP (Rule Active and toggle rule, rules are associated with the various faults and traps (managed objects) that can occur; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 12, lines 46-49; col. 15, lines 5-57), and

more than two objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition (toggle rule allows at least two different traps (objects) to be correlated to generate a meta-trap to the network management server; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57).

g. As per claim 2, Faigon further teaches:

the TrapFlag field being a field for indicating whether a trap is to be generated for each object described in the MIB (Rule Active specifies whether the rule is active or not; col. 12, lines 46-49).

h. As per claim 3, Faigon further teaches:

a value of the TrapFlag field being set as 'ON' state or 'OFF' state by the manager (Rule Active specifies whether the rule is active

Art Unit: 2141

or not, has a Boolean value, rules are specified by the network manager; col. 12, lines 4-11, 46-49).

i. As per claim 5, Faigon further teaches:

the TrapPeer field being a field for defining a trap generation condition for an object (toggle rules correlate multiple traps (objects) and the network manager is not informed unless all toggle rules are met; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57; Fig. 14A).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anger et al. (6,009,431) in view of Faigon et al. (6,006,016).

j. As per claim 1, Anger teaches:

trap generation of an SNMP which is operated between a manager and at least one agent (col. 1, lines 25-44), and

a TrapFlag field and a TrapPeer field are defined for each management object resource in describing an MIB of an SNMP (object defined in an MIB has various fields, one could be "TrapFlag" and another "TrapPeer"; Figs. 3-4; col. 2, line 64 - col. 3, line 57).

Art Unit: 2141

However, the Faigon invention does not explicitly teach controlling the generation of traps or having more than two objects correlated to define a trap generation condition. Anger teaches:

controlling the generation of traps by having more than two objects correlated to define a trap generation condition (toggle rule allows at least two different traps (objects) to be correlated to generate a meta-trap to the network management server; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to control the generation of traps in the Anger invention by correlating more than two objects to define a trap generation condition, as taught by Faigon, because this would reduce the number of traps sent to the management server, reducing the burden on the management server and allowing the management server to focus attention on real changes in the managed device, like state changes, as taught by Faigon; col. 11, lines 18-30).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 9-23 are allowed.
10. Claims 4 and 6-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Art Unit: 2141

k. Claims 9 and 14 provide two distinct elements lacking from claim 1 that make them allowable.

According to claim 9 and 14, the TrapFlag field and the TrapPeer field are defined in an MIB of an agent. In contrast, the claim language of claim 1 does not clearly determine whether the fields are defined in an MIB for an object or if they are just arbitrarily defined anywhere in the system for the object managed in the MIB. Therefore, the Faigon reference taught fields that were outside of the MIB that read on the claim.

Furthermore, claims 9 and 14 further define TrapFlag and TrapPeer. This is what makes claims 9 and 14 allowable over the prior art. Otherwise, these fields could be any arbitrary field defined in the MIB of an agent. No prior art teaches a field that is set in the MIB according to a message outputted from the manager or a field that is set by the agent according to a trap generation condition in the MIB, as claimed in claim 9. Furthermore, no prior art teaches traps being generated in accordance to fields in an MIB definition being in the ON state, as claimed in claim 14. In addition, no prior art provided motivation for adding such fields to an MIB of an agent. Rather, prior art tends to parallel the Faigon invention and rely on other solutions outside of an MIB of an agent for controlling trap generation.

In contrast, claim 1 does not clearly define what the TrapFlag and TrapPeer fields are or what they do until claim 4 and 6 respectively, and therefore are interpreted to be any field in the MIB taught by Anger. Claim 4 claims that an agent will not generate a trap with the TrapFlag field in the 'OFF' state. In Faigon and other

Art Unit: 2141

prior arts, the agent generates a trap regardless and the trap is handled later by some other means, and the 'ON/OFF' states control the other means. Claim 6 claims that the TrapPeer field is an 'ON/OFF' state and that it is controlled by the agent, also not taught by the prior art.

**Conclusion**

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D Shaw whose telephone number is 703-305-0094. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday and alternate Fridays, 7am - 4pm.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Joseph Shaw  
Examiner  
AU 2141



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER